

From: [Alex](#)
To: [Dukes, Jerisha](#)
Cc: [Heather Smith](#); [Katie Brown](#); [Rebecca J. Dulin](#); [Frank R. Ellerbe III](#); [Samuel Wellborn](#); [Knowles, Alex](#); [Grube-Lybarker, Carri](#); [Hall, Roger](#); [Wessinger-Hill, JoAnne](#); [Butler, David](#); [PSC Contact](#)
Subject: Re: [External] Re: Alex Kadoshnikov DN. 2020-218-E
Date: Thursday, November 5, 2020 11:17:27 AM

I wanted to thank the Public Service Commission for the ability to express my concerns and for them to be heard and looked into and then ruled upon the outcome of the findings.

In regards to Duke Energy's request for a reconsideration of the motion to dismiss, it should not be granted for the following reasons listed below...

From day one I asked for documentation to the safety of the meters. I was passed from one person to another on the phone without getting anywhere. Like mentioned before this is very unprofessional. To this day even without submitting anything they are asking the Commission to close their eyes to this fact and just forget it was ever brought up. Duke Energy could have been professional from day one and said, Mr Kadoshnikov, you have a concern, we will get you the documentation you are asking for, here are phone numbers to independent laboratories that have tested our smart meters, here is the FCC's compliance sheet (the head of the FCC are previous telecom executives, if this is not a conflict of interest than I don't know what is). Here is our in house researchers that you can talk to, and here is the telephone of other agencies that can give you more detailed information. Is there anything else that we can do for you Mr Kadoshnikov.

If this is the way our first interaction have went, I would not be filing a official complaint before the commission. I have asked representatives from Duke Energy so many times for documentation that I have lost track of the count. This case has to go one, they have yet to answer any of my questions, if this is not bulling a customer and trying to get away with it, giving me no choice but it's our way or the highway than, than I don't what is.

Here are more questions that I want answered and I will provide all my testimony soon, thank you for being so patient with me:

As attorney for the Coalition Against Smart Meters and 5G, I am delivering a 44 page demand to Mayer Durkan, the Seattle City Council, Seattle City Light, Governor Jay Inslee, Attorney General Bob Ferguson, Utilities Commissioner David Danner, Insurance Commissioner Michael Kreidler, and all other elected officials in Washington.

The Coalition is demanding that Seattle City Light and other utility districts stop installing smart meters and replace smart meters already installed.

The Coalition is demanding that all candidates for office state their position on smart meters and 5G.

Smart meters are illegal. They violate several provisions of the National Electrical Code and the National Electrical Safety Code, both of which are incorporated as part of Washington law.

They are illegal first because they lack a path for surges to go to ground, and second because they have inadequate surge protection.

Smart meters are not grounded at all, and their surge protection is good only up to 300 volts. When trees fall and two 240 volt lines get crossed, 480 volts enters smart meters. They explode and catch fire. Around 2,000 amps flows into the building and burns out wiring, equipment, and appliances.

The analog meters being replaced are well grounded and have a robust spark gap protector, which easily shunts a 480 volt surge to ground.

Most people think that their 200 amp panel protects against surges SENT into their home from outside. This is not true. Your panel only protects against current DRAWN INTO your home by an excessive load or a short.

When surges destroy wiring and appliances, your insurance will not cover your loss unless you have a specific rider, which may cost extra.

Smart meters cost \$200 or more, whereas new analog meters from China cost \$50. Perfectly good, refurbished analog meters, including a warranty, can be bought from Florida for \$25.

Smart meters wear out in five to seven years, whereas analog meters last 40 years.

Smart meters consume a significant amount of electricity just to operate. They are always on. They are little computers and have circuit boards. They build up heat. Computers are too fragile to be in a meter. Smart meters measure watts used inaccurately.

Any savings from laying off meter readers will be more than exceeded by higher costs.

Analog meters consume only a tiny amount of electricity to turn their aluminum wheels and measure watts used. They do not build up heat. Analog meters measure watts more accurately than do smart meters.

Smart meters violate privacy by collecting in detail our every electrical behavior. There is no law to prevent Seattle from selling private information collected, and utility companies elsewhere are doing this. Marketers will know when you turn off your bedroom light and turn on your vibrator.

Smart meters have an exterior terminal port. Anyone with the right size optical probe can plug into it and have complete access to the meter, the home, and the network.

Smart meters come with a broadcasting and relaying radios that operate at cell phone

and Wi-Fi frequencies and higher, chirping out constant reports of your electrical activity up to 190,000 times per day. They also produce dirty electricity, which propagates over every wire in your home.

The Coalition also opposes non-communicating smart meters. They too are not grounded, have inadequate surge protection, and produce dirty electricity.

Washington courts say that an easement should not impose a “greater burden” than “originally contemplated”. Easements granted to SCL years ago contemplated a grounded, surge protected, and fireproof meter, one which did not collect and sell our private information. Smart meters exceed the scope of the easements granted.

Seattle cannot by threatening to cut off electricity to force people to accept a meter which is illegal and which exceeds the scope of the easement granted.

In New Hampshire customers do not have to have to opt out. The law there requires utility companies to get customers to opt in.

The New Mexico Public Service Commission recently banned smart meters for all the reasons listed in this press release.

Smart meters will put meter readers out of work, but any such savings will be exceeded by the cost of the new meters, the cost of replacing the meters more frequently, the increased consumption of electricity system wide, the cost of liability insurance, the cost of covering uninsurable liabilities, and the cost of paying off lawsuits for damage to appliances and equipment.

Smart meters and 5G are profitable frauds. They raise utility bills. They consume more electricity system wide. They raise costs for SCL and reduce operating surplus or profit. They offer no benefits whatsoever. They are an inferior technology. The companies that make them should voluntarily take them off the market.

Cell phones and smart meters broadcast in the same frequency bands. The difference is the cell phones can be turned off, but smart meters are broadcasting 24/7. It may take ten or 20 years, but many, many people will come down with cancer from smart meters, just as John McCain came down with cancer on the left side of his face where he had held his cell phone. The radiation is cumulative. It also damages eyes.

Some customers can opt out, but others cannot. Only those living in one to four unit homes can opt out. Renters can opt out only if the landlord agrees. Those in buildings with five or more units cannot opt out. Schools, businesses, and churches cannot opt out. Those with solar roofs may not opt out. This discrimination is unconstitutional.

5G will die of its own weight. First, because unsightly 5G cell towers will be required at every street corner. Second, because 5G will be used mostly to transmit video, which is better watched on a hard-wired connection. Third, because each 5G cell tower will have to be connected to fiber optic for 5G to work. It would make more sense to extend fiber a few more feet to each home and business.

The Coalition is demanding that all candidates for office state their position on smart meters and 5G. Candidates will ignore this issue unless the media presses them to state their positions.

Smart meters have been installed on around 40 percent of all homes and buildings in the United States, and we predict that they will all be removed and replaced with standard analog meters.

It is inevitable that some class action law firm will bring a Consumer Protection Act suit to stop smart meters and 5G – unless Seattle voluntarily bans them.

The Coalition is submitting 72 specific Requests for Disclosure of Public Records addressed to Seattle and Seattle City Light, covering questions about smart meters. These are issues which Seattle should have addressed before deciding to install smart meters.

Sincerely,

James Robert Deal, as Attorney for

Coalition Against Smart Meters and 5G

WSBA Number 8103

I have addressed many of these issues with the commission, the fire hazards having no fuse, the privacy concern, EMF concern, and many others and I will in detail discuss everything soon.

So please dismiss Duke Energy's reconsideration request, they need to account to the commission now since they could not answer my basic questions and are now running in the other direction. Thank you once again for all that you do for this great country, for this incredible state, and may God give you guidance in this matter.

Yours truly,

Alex Kadoshnikov.

Good Afternoon Mr. Kadoshnikov,

Please note the following schedule, outlined in the "Prefile Testimony Letter":

1. **The Defendant/Respondent and the Office of Regulatory Staff** must prefile with the Commission 1 copy of direct testimony and exhibits of the Witnesses they intend to present and serve the testimony and exhibits of the Witnesses on all Parties of Record on or before November 5, 2020. (must be post-marked on or before this date).
2. The **Complainant/Petitioner** filing **Rebuttal Testimony** must prefile with the Commission 1 copy of the testimony and exhibits of the Witnesses it intends to present and serve the testimony and exhibits of the Witnesses on all Parties of Record **on or before November 17, 2020**. (Rebuttal testimony and exhibits must be in the offices of the Commission and in the hands of the parties on this date).
3. The **Defendant/Respondent and the ORS** filing **Surrebuttal Testimony** must prefile with the Commission 1 copy of the testimony and exhibits of the Witnesses they intend to present and serve the testimony and exhibits of the Witnesses on all Parties of Record **on or before November 24, 2020**. (Surrebuttal testimony and exhibits must be in the offices of the Commission and in the hands of the parties on this date).

Submitting your rebuttal testimony next Thursday will meet the Commission's rebuttal testimony deadline; however, as Complainant/Petitioner in this docket, your rebuttal testimony is not due until November 17, 2020.

You have also requested a phone call to inquire about deadlines, the order of meeting, and other miscellaneous questions. Attached to this email are the "Notice of Hearing and Prefile Testimony Deadlines" and "Prefile Testimony Letter," which outline the deadlines in this docket. Regarding your other questions, please be advised that all parties to this docket must participate in any conversation held with an attorney employed with the Commission. As such, please send your questions via email to all parties to this docket. Where possible and without giving legal advice, the Commission will work to answer your questions.

Without offering or providing legal advice, I offer the following limited procedural information to direct you to resources available to everyone. Article 8, "Practice and Procedure," Chapter 103 of the SC Code of State Regulations outlines the procedures which are required to be followed and practiced by all parties or persons appearing before or filing a matter with the Commission. You can also find a Pro Se Litigant Guide on the Commission's website (www.psc.sc.gov/publications/pro-se-litigant-guide). Lastly, you may conduct a search of the Commission's Docket Management System to find examples of pleadings submitted by parties in other dockets.

I hope the information outlined above proves helpful. Thank you for your follow-up and inquiry.

In accordance with Commission practices and procedures, should you respond to this email, please remember to hit "reply all" so that there is no inadvertent,

accidental ex parte communication in this Docket, regardless if such procedural communication may be exempt by statute.

With warm regards,

Jerisha Dukes, Esq.

Public Service Commission

State of South Carolina

101 Executive Center Drive, Suite 100

Columbia, SC 29210

www.psc.sc.gov

803-896-5100 (ph) | 803-896-5231 (f) | Jerisha.Dukes@psc.sc.gov

The information contained in this e-mail message is public and will be filed in the Docketing Management System (DMS) for the corresponding docketed matter. Any responsive e-mail message by you should also be filed by you in the DMS for this matter. **If the reader of this message does not want certain information, which is meant to be discussed only between the parties and not Public Service Commission of South Carolina (Commission) staff, please do not use “reply all” to this message.** Any e-mail message involving the Commission or Commission staff is also subject to the provisions of Commission Order No. 2019-748 in Docket No. 2019-329-A and shall be published in the docket for this matter. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify us by telephone at (803) 896-5100.

From: Alex <a11e1x@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, November 4, 2020 9:11 AM

To: Dukes, Jerisha <Jerisha.Dukes@psc.sc.gov>

Cc: Heather Smith <heather.smith@duke-energy.com>; Katie Brown <katie.brown2@duke-energy.com>; Rebecca J. Dulin <Rebecca.Dulin@duke-energy.com>; Frank R. Ellerbe III <fellerbe@robinsongray.com>; Samuel Wellborn <swellborn@robinsongray.com>; Knowles, Alex <aknowles@ors.sc.gov>; Grube-Lybarker, Carri <clybarker@scconsumer.gov>; Hall, Roger <RHall@scconsumer.gov>; Wessinger-Hill, JoAnne <JoAnne.Hill@psc.sc.gov>; Butler, David <David.Butler@psc.sc.gov>

Subject: [External] Re: Alex Kadoshnikov DN. 2020-218-E

Good morning. I have been waiting for a phone call from the lawyer for the commission and now see that an email was sent instead.

Not knowing if the case would be heard before the commission, I sent an email reply to Duke Energy's request. I am grateful that the commission voted to hear my case. I was not aware that I had to have all my evidence in to the commission so that Duke Energy could come back with their arguments. I was hoping to discuss all of these procedures with the lawyer from the commission so that I would know what the exact next steps are.

I am asking the commission to give me till next Thursday to send everything I have against Duke Energy. If that is not possible, we can proceed as outlined of course.

I would still like a phone call from a lawyer so that I know exactly when everything is due, how the commission meeting will take place, and to get my basic questions answered.

Thsnk you so much for your time,

Alex Kadoshnikov

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

On Mon, Nov 2, 2020 at 7:58, Dukes, Jerisha

<Jerisha.Dukes@psc.sc.gov> wrote:

Good Morning Mr. Kadoshnikov,

The Commission received your phone call regarding legal questions. To avoid any potential ex parte communication, I am responding to you via email in lieu of returning your phone call. Please feel free to submit your question by emailing all parties on the communication. Thank you in advance for consideration of this request.

In accordance with Commission practices and procedures, please remember to hit "reply all" when responding so that there is no inadvertent, accidental ex parte communication in this Docket, regardless if such procedural communication may be exempt by statute.

With warm regards,

Jerisha Dukes, Esq.

Public Service Commission

State of South Carolina

101 Executive Center Drive, Suite 100

Columbia, SC 29210

www.psc.sc.gov

803-896-5100 (ph) | 803-896-5231 (f) | Jerisha.Dukes@psc.sc.gov

From: Alvarez, Colanthia <Colanthia.Alvarez@psc.sc.gov>

Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2020 11:10 AM

To: Wessinger-Hill, JoAnne <JoAnne.Hill@psc.sc.gov>; Butler, David <David.Butler@psc.sc.gov>; Stark, David <david.stark@psc.sc.gov>; Dukes, Jerisha <Jerisha.Dukes@psc.sc.gov>; Minges, Josh <Josh.Minges@psc.sc.gov>

Subject: Alex Kadoshnikov DN. 2020-218-E

Will someone call Mr. Kadoshnikov, regarding legal questions @ 864-473-7517

Thanks

Colanthia B. Alvarez

Clerk's Office